

## Appendix 1

### Technical details of the ICVS

- T.1 Response rates
  - T.2 City surveys: 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2000
- 
- 1 Summary of organisation and methodology
  - 2 Weighting procedures

Table 1 Response rates<sup>1</sup>

	1989			1992			1996			2000		
	Eligibles <sup>2</sup>	Completed	%	Eligibles	Completed	%	Eligibles	Completed	%	Eligibles	Completed	%
Austria	4,425	2,012	45	3,489	2,006	57	1,983	1,507	76	3,468	2,005	58
Australia	5,535	2,060	37	3,366	1,485	44				4,326	2,402	56
Belgium	4,793	2,074	43	3,321	2,152	65	2,873	2,134	74	3,655	2,078	57
Canada										4,000	2,909	73
Catalonia (Spain)										4,552	3,007	66
Denmark	4,717	2,006	43	5,208	2,001	38	3,697	2,171	59	3,422	1,947	57
England & Wales	1,474	1,025	70	1,879	1,620	86	4,509	3,899	86	2,310	1,783	77
Finland	2,918	1,502	51				1,651	1,003	61	2,208	1,000	45
France	17,479	5,274	30									
Germany (West)												
Italy				3,321	2,024	61						
Japan <sup>3</sup>	3,014	2,411	80	3,015	2,382	79				3,000	2,211	74
Netherlands	3,067	2,000	65	3,012	2,000	66	3,206	2,008	63	3,459	2,001	58
New Zealand				3,154	2,048	65						
Northern Ireland <sup>4</sup>	—	2,000	—				1,247	1,042	84	1,930	1,565	81
Norway	1,425	1,009	71									
Portugal										3,569	2,000	56
Scotland	4,856	2,007	41				3,496	2,194	63	3,546	2,040	58
Spain	2,616	862	33									
Poland <sup>5</sup>				2,118	2,033	96	3,695	3,483	94	6,741	5,276	78
Sweden				2,227	1,707	77	1,328	1,000	75	3,008	2,000	66
Switzerland	1,464	1,000	68				1,794	1,000	56	6,494	4,234	65
USA	5,429	1,996	37	2,973	1,501	50	2,506	1,003	40	1,656	1,000	60

1 Response rates are based on completed interviews divided by eligible contacts. Those not interviewed include refusals, those with language or hearing difficulties, respondent not available, no eligible respondent, and invalid interviews.

2 'Eligible contacts' are the gross sample less 'non-relevant' contacts (ie, number busy, no answer and disconnected business number).

3 The number of eligible interviews in Japan 2000 includes non-contacts and is therefore an underestimate compared to the others.

4 As the Northern Ireland sample in 1989 was a quota sample of respondents interviewed face-to-face, response rates are not available.

5 The number of eligible interviews in Poland (1992) is from a given response rates of +95% and the number interviewed.

**Table 2 City surveys: 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2000**

Europe		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Tirana	Albania			R	•	
Minsk	Belarus			•	•	
Sofia	Bulgaria			•	•	
Barcelona	Catalonia (Spain)			<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	
Zagreb	Croatia			•	•	
Prague	Czech Republic		[ <i>M</i> ]	M+R	•	[as part of Czechoslovakia]
Tallinn	Estonia		R	M+R	•	
Tbilisi	Georgia		M	M+R	•	
Budapest	Hungary			•	•	
Bishkek	Kyrgyzstan			M+R		
Riga	Latvia			(M+R) (M)		(1995) (1998)
Vilnius	Lithuania			M+R	•	
	Malta			(•)		(National survey)
Skopje	Macedonia			•	na	
Warsaw	Poland	•	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	na	
Bucharest	Romania			R	•	
Moscow	Russia		•	•	•	
Bratislava	Slovak Republic		[ <i>M</i> ]	•		[as part of Czechoslovakia]
Ljubljana	Slovenia		•	R	•	
Kiev	Ukraine			•	•	
Belgrade	Yugoslavia			•	na	
Asia		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Beijing	China		•			
Bombay	India		•	R		
Jakarta	Indonesia	( <i>S</i> )	M+R	M+R		(Surabaya)
Seoul	Korea				na	
Ulaan Baatar	Mongolia			R	•	
Manila	The Philippines		•	R	na	
Pt Moresby	Papua New Guinea		M+R na			

Table 2 (continued)

Africa		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Gaborone	Botswana			•	na	(1998)
Cairo	Egypt		•			
Maseru	Lesotho				•	
Windhoek	Namibia				•	
Lagos	Nigeria			(•)		
Johannesburg	South Africa		•	•	•	
Mbabane	Swaziland				•	
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania		•			
Tunis	Tunisia		•			
Kampala	Uganda		•	R	na	
Lusaka	Zambia				•	
Harare	Zimbabwe			•		
Latin America		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Buenos Aires	Argentina		•	•	•	
Rio de Janeiro	Brazil		•	•		
La Paz	Bolivia			•		
Bogotá	Colombia			•	na	
San Jose	Costa Rica		R	R		
Mexico	Mexico				na	
Citysuncion						
Panama	Panama				•	
Asunción	Paraguay			•		

R small rural sample included

M multiple cities

N from a national survey

na no dataset available at the time of printing

## 1 Summary of organisation and methodology for the 2000 surveys in the industrialised countries

International co-ordination in the industrialised countries:

Peter Willems, Interview-NSS, Amsterdam (11 countries)

John van Kesteren, NSCR & Leiden University (6 countries)

*financier*: Ministry of Justice, the Hague

### *Australia*

*national co-ordinator*: Carlos Carcach, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra

*financier*: Commonwealth Attorney General's Department, Canberra

*fieldwork*: Roy Morgan Research Pty. Ltd.

*sampling method*: random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member

*interview method*: CATI

### *Belgium*

*national co-ordinator*: Freddy Gazan, Ministry of Justice, Brussels

*financier*: Ministry of Justice, Brussels

*fieldwork*: NID/Interview-NSS

*sampling method*: random digit dialling, throidahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method*: CATI

### *Canada*

*national co-ordinator*: Kwing Hung, Department of Justice, Ottawa

*financier*: Department of Justice, Research and statistics department, Ottawa

*fieldwork*: Canadian Facts / Interview-NSS

*sampling method*: random digit dialling, throidahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method*: CATI

### *Catalonia (Spain)*

*national co-ordinator*: Eulalia Luque Reina, Centre of legal Studies. Justice Department Autonomous Government of Catalonia

*financier*: Autonomous Government of Catalonia

*fieldwork*: Centre of Legal Studies of Justice Department

*sampling method*: random sample from the telephone registry, does not account for households with non-registered telephone numbers

*interview method*: telephone interviewing, but not computer assisted

*Denmark*

*national co-ordinator:* Flemming Balvig, University of Copenhagen  
*financier:* Ministry of Justice  
*fieldwork:* Vilstrup Research / Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*England and Wales*

*national co-ordinator:* Pat Mayhew, Home Office, London  
*financier:* Home Office, London  
*fieldwork:* BMRB/Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Finland*

*national co-ordinator:* Kauko Aromaa, National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Helsinki  
*financier:* National Research Institute of Legal Policy & Statistics Finland, Helsinki  
*fieldwork:* Statistics Finland, Helsinki  
*sampling method:* random sample of individuals age 15 and older was taken from the population registry. For the ICVS, respondents 16 years and older are selected  
*interview method:* CATI

*France*

*national co-ordinator:* Frédéric Ocquteau, Institut des Hautes Études de la Sécurité Intérieure, Paris  
*financier:* Institut des Hautes Études de la Sécurité Intérieure, Paris  
*fieldwork:* Efficience 3 / Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, throidahl carter for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Japan*

*national co-ordinator:* Koichi Hamai, Ministry of Justice, Tokyo  
*financier:* Ministry of Justice, Tokyo

*sampling method:* two stage sampling; A sample of 209 cities/villages, stratified by town size was taken. Within these cities/villages a random sample of individuals from the population registry

*interview method:* face to face

*Netherlands*

*national co-ordinator:* John van Kesteren, Leiden University

*financier:* Ministry of Justice, the Hague

*fieldwork:* Interview-NSS

*sampling method:* random digit dialling, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method:* CATI

*Northern Ireland*

*national co-ordinator:* Debbie Donnelly, Northern Ireland Office, Belfast

*financier:* Northern Ireland Office, Belfast

*fieldwork:* UMS/Interview-NSS

*sampling method:* random sample of households based on electoral register, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method:* CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing)

*Poland*

*national co-ordinator:* Andrzej Siemaszko, Institute of Justice, Ministry of Justice, Warsaw

*financier:* Institute of Justice, Ministry of Justice, Warsaw

*fieldwork:* CBOS, Warsaw

*sampling method:* Sampling of households, stratified by region and town size within the regions. Respondents were selected by the 'next birthday' criterion

*interview method:* face to face

*Portugal*

*national co-ordinator:* Antonio Carlos Duarte Fonseca, Ministry of Justice, Lisbon

*financier:* Ministry of Justice, Lisbon

*fieldwork:* Ipsos/Interview-NSS

*sampling method:* random digit dialling, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method:* CATI

*Scotland*

*national co-ordinator:* Fiona Fraser, Scottish Executive Justice Department, Edinburgh  
*financier:* Scottish Executive Justice Department, Edinburgh  
*fieldwork:* BMRB/Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Sweden*

*national co-ordinator:* Jan Ahlberg, National Council for Crime Prevention, Stockholm  
*financier:* National Council for Crime Prevention, Stockholm  
*fieldwork:* TEMO/Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, throdahl carter for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Switzerland*

*national co-ordinator:* Martin Killias, University of Lausanne  
*financier:* Offices of Police, Justice & Statistics + several local police departments  
*fieldwork:* M.I.S. Trend SA, Lausanne  
*sampling method:* sample of households from telephone directory, stratified by city / canton. There was an oversampling of the large cities, these additional cases are downweighted to ensure representative figures for the whole of Switzerland  
*interview method:* CATI  
*questionnaire:* the Swiss questionnaire was different. All items on victimisation however and some of the follow-up items were taken from the basic ICVS questionnaire. Only these corresponding items are used in this report

*USA*

*national co-ordinator:* Carol Kalish, United States Department of Justice, Washington  
*financier:* United States Department of Justice, Washington  
*fieldwork:* Walker Info / Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, throdahl carter for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

## 2 Weighting procedures

### *The need for weighting*

In each randomly selected household only one randomly selected respondent aged 16 or over was interviewed. No substitution of the selected respondent with another household member was allowed. This procedure guarantees a high quality sample and eliminates the disadvantage of quota sampling that the most co-operative respondent in a household is interviewed.

People in households of different sizes have different probabilities of being chosen for the interview, and a weighting procedure is needed to correct this to generate a representative sample of 'persons'. For instance, in a household comprising five people of 16 years or older, the chance of any one of them being interviewed is only one in five. In such large households, the responses of the selected interviewee need to be upweighted. Otherwise, respondents from small households are over-represented. Weighting of the results is done to give the number of people in households of different sizes the proper weight of their proportion in the population.

Apart from the household to person translation, which is made by weighting, corrections have also been applied to make the samples as representative as possible in terms of gender, age and regional distribution.

### *Methodology*

For each country, the most recent statistics on how many of the population were in households of different sizes were used as reference. Additional input for the weighting procedure concerned population size, gender, age and regional population distribution. No appropriate international statistics were available on other criteria such as household income, urbanisation, professional activities, tenure etc to enable them to be used in weighting. Some of these variables, though, would be desirable for this purpose. In most countries, appropriate statistics concerning how the population of those 16 years or older ('adults') were distributed within households were either unavailable or inadequate. Thus, these statistics were derived from the present study itself.

First, on the basis of the available statistics on how many of the population were in households of different sizes, the samples were weighted, taking into account also region and gender. This was done in an iterative weighting procedure in which individual weights for individual respondents were computed to achieve weighted results with marginal totals on gender and region corresponding to population distributions.

In the survey itself, the composition of the households was determined by asking each respondent how many persons the household as a whole consisted of, and also how many were 16 years or older.

Using the weighted results on household size, compared to the distribution of household size in the population showed no significant deviation. Therefore we used the weighted distribution of number of adults from the sample as an estimate for the population. This

resulted in *household weights* that were computed based on gender, household size and regional distribution.

The *individual weights* were computed using the same iterative procedure, but apart from gender and regional distribution, also age and number of adults in the household served as criteria.

A different weighting procedure was applied for Japan, Catalonia (Spain) and Poland. Since these samples were stratified by region, no weighting on region was necessary. First, an initial individual weight was computed (ie, the number of people aged 16 or over in the household, divided by the average number of persons of this age in the sample). This accounts for the larger chance that people from smaller households have of being selected. (This was not done for Japan, since this was a sample of individuals.) Based on this initial weight, a two-way table by age and gender was computed. The initial weight, multiplied by the ratio of what the percentage should be (according to census data) and what was found in the sample, was applied as individual weight. The household weight was computed by dividing the individual weight by the number of persons 16 or older in the household, multiplied by the average number of persons of this age. The distribution over the strata using weighted data was checked against the unweighted data; no obvious deviations were found.